

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments**

#### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Applicant has amended the independent claims to more particularly point out the calculation of the ratio between two sets of motion vectors. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments; support may be found in the Specification, *intra alia*, at paragraphs 110.

### **Rejections**

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

#### **Claims 1-3, 11, 18, 24 and 25**

Claims 1-3, 11, 18, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of U.S. Patent 6,058,140 to Smolenski and U.S. Patent 5,892,550 to Iwasaki et al. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the invention claimed in claim 1-3, 11, 18, 24 and 25.

The Examiner admits that Smolenski does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed element of identifying a repeated field by comparing a ratio of first and second sets of motion vectors. The Examiner is relying on Iwasaki as disclosing this element. Applicant notes that the Examiner has improperly cited one of Iwasaki's claims in his argument. Because prior art claims may not be the basis for rejecting a claim, Applicant's arguments are directed to the disclosure of column 8, line 41 through column 9, line 10 of Iwasaki.

Iwasaki discloses detecting duplicate fields using interframe difference signals. However, Iwasaki does not teach or even suggest that the interframe difference signals are calculated using sets of motion vectors as claimed. Furthermore, Iwasaki does not disclose calculating a ratio between the sums of magnitudes of the motion vectors in two sets as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-3, 11, 18, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Smolenski and Iwasaki.

### **Claims 8-10, 12-13, 19 and 27**

Claims 8-10, 12-13, 19 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Smolenski and Iwasaki in light of U.S. Patent 6,041,142 to Rao et al. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the invention claimed in claims 8-10, 12-13, 19 and 27. Claims 8-10, 12-13, 19 and 27 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 24.

Rao discloses detecting of redundant data fields in a video stream uses field activity (FA) and strip activity (SA) of two successive fields. However, Rao does not teach or suggest using a ratio between two sets of motion vectors to identify a duplicate field as claimed in the independent claims. Nor does Rao disclose calculating a ratio as claimed in the independent claims. Since neither Smolenski and Iwasaki teach these claim limitations, the combination Smolenski, Iwasaki and Rao cannot be properly interpreted as rendering obvious the invention claimed in the dependent claims.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 9, 12 and 19, the Examiner asserts that Rao discloses Applicant's claimed limitation of replacing a repeated field with a reference to a field from which the repeated field is repeated. However, Rao discloses that a repeated field is replaced with another field but does not teach or suggest that the repeated field is replaced with a *reference* to another field as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10, 12-13, 19 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Smolenski, Iwasaki and Rao.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 4-7, 14-17 and 20-23 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all the limitations of the intervening claims. Because Applicant believes all the pending claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above, Applicant has not so amended claims 4-7, 14-17 and 20-23 in the present response.

### SUMMARY

Claims 1-27 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Sue Holloway at (408) 720-8300 x309.


### Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR  
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Sept. 12, 2005



Sheryl Sue Holloway  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,850

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300